DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 973 RC 012 501

AUTHOR Noboa, Abdin
TITLE Hispanics and Desegregation: Analysis and Interpretation of a National Study.
INSTITUTION Aspira, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 3 Jun 80
GRANT NIE-G-780226
NOTE 37p.; For related documents, see ED 190 270-275. Paper presented at the Forum for Responsible Federal Educational Policy (Washington, DC, June 3, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Blacks; Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; *Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Litigation; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography; Government Role; *Hispanic Americans; Integration Studies; *Multicultural Education; Public Schools; Racial Integration; Racial Relations; Racial Segregation; School Policy; *School Segregation

ABSTRACT

An analysis and interpretation of a five-volume study by Aspira, Inc., which examined Hispanic segregation in U.S. schools, presents an overview of the study, general findings, and a summary and conclusions, including recommendations for further study and analysis and general policy recommendations. Segregation trends for Hispanics are discussed in terms of the relationship between segregation and school practices, bilingual education and desegregation, language instruction, special education, discipline, grade retention, staffing, and a comparison of Hispanic and Black segregation trends. The findings of two ethnographic studies are: school desegregation plans should distinguish the needs of Blacks and other minorities from those of Hispanics; desegregation plans should adhere to existing guidelines for bilingual education; desegregation requires a larger Hispanic staff; different socio-economic sectors of the Hispanic community respond in varying ways to desegregation; and many urban Hispanics perceive that desegregation may be detrimental to bilingual education. General conclusions are that Hispanic isolation from Blacks and Whites will probably increase; Hispanics will become the most segregated racial group in the 1980's; Hispanic segregation from Whites and Blacks is increasing in unpredictable patterns in many tri-ethnic communities; and the either/or option of bilingual education vs. school desegregation need not occur. (AN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

Rec'd 29 January 1981

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED198973

# HISPANICS AND DESEGREGATION:

## Analysis and Interpretation of a National Study

Abdin Noboa
Director
Latino Institute, D.C. Area Office
1760 Reston Ave., Suite 101
Reston, VA 22090

Paper presented at the Forum for Responsible Federal Educational Policy
Sponsored by the Aspira Center for Educational Equity

Washington, D.C.
June 3, 1980

Gold Room

Rayburn House Office Building

RC012501

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Abdin Noboa
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# PREFACE

As with descriptive studies of this nature, Aspira may be strongly criticized for insufficiently advocating one particular perspective as opposed to another. The purpose of this project is to document the trends that exist in desegregation among Hispanics. While much is contained in these volumes, it is but a beginning documentation effort and is certainly not as sufficiently analytical as the data would warrant. The scope of the study prohibited the latter at the outset.

Since much of our statistical compilation is based on the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) Elementary and Secondary Education Survey (forms 101 and 102) we must caution, from the outset, that the accuracy of the data base has been strongly criticized by the Children's Defense Fund, other advocacy organizations, and local educational practitioners. Our generalizations are as good as the data from which they are derived and our funds were insufficient to assess their reliability. Notwithstanding, inasmuch as Federal penalties can be levied against the willful misreporting of student counts, we are confident the data is reasonably accurate for our projections. There is no evidence by this author to warrant the data base unusable. In addition, it is also the only comprehensive national data base containing race and national origin categories for elementary and secondary school age children.

I am very concerned about the misrepresentation of our data in subsequent articles. The careless proliferation of research findings sometimes make this unavoidable from those who wish to make a point, regardless of what the date may indicate. Although we cannot control this practice, we would like to make several issues very clear: 1) Aspira is not advocating for or against desegregation in this series of volumes; it simply reports the condition of education for Hispanic children within the context of desegregation. 2) It is not advocating separatism in support for maintenance of bilingual education programs. The data does not indicate these are mutually exclusive processes. 3) We support the enhancement of equitable services which increase the educational advancement of Hispanic children. If, and when, school desegregation efforts and other educational policies negatively impact on these ends, we must question the efficacy of such efforts for our children. 4) We must stress that desegregation need not be antithetical to bilingual education or against special services for Hispanic children, although in some instances, practice clearly made it so.

Abdin Noboa
June 1980

I

## INTRODUCTION

School segregation is a process which continues to affect many minority population groups in this country. Dual school systems were abrogated by a 1954 Supreme Court decision affirming the fourteenth amendment of the U.S. Constitution which guarantees protection under the law for all citizens. This was further reinforced through Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which guarantees equal educational opportunity.

School segregation can no longer be perceived as an exclusively Southern problem, nor can blacks continue to be viewed as the sole targets of this practice. Asians, Native Americans, and Hispanics have been victims of discrimination and segregation in all areas of the country. Each of these groups, to varying degrees, are involved in the school desegregation movement. Aspira's study of "Hispanic Segregation Trends,"[1] conducted in 1978-78, focuses on only one of those groups - the Hispanics - examining the history of their segregation, extent of Hispanic segregation in U.S. schools, discriminatory schooling practices against them, and the effect of these activities among school children, parents, and various Hispanic communities.

### School Desegregation Litigation

A cursory review of the literature reveals that Hispanics have been victims of segregationist practices since before the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848. Even after the Treaty, courts debated whether Mexicans from Texas were indeed U.S. citizens [McKinney v. Saviego (1856)]. After the passage of the fourteenth amendment a similar question surfaced again [Rodriguez v. State of Texas (1897)]. In this latter instance, naturalization laws for blacks and whites did not apply to Hispanics. Since laws were less rigidly defined for Hispanics than for blacks, Latinos faced the brunt of racistic enforcement. This practice, however, was not limited to Hispanics.

[1] This five volume report is the result of a major study sponsored with funds from the National Institute of Education (Grant no. NIE-G-780226). The fall report is expected to come out as an Aspira publication by 1981.

In 1927 the courts held that a Chinese girl not classified as white was, therefore, "black" and tried to bar her entrance to an all white school [Gong Lum v. Rice (1927)].

Our review of litigation history revealed that it wasn't until 1948 in Delgado v. Bastrop that segregation of Mexican American children from "other white" children was declared illegal. However, the case was won because there was no state law allowing segregation. The year marked a century since the Treaty.

In 1951 the courts ruled that segregation of public school children of Mexican descent deprived them of their constitutional rights of due process and equal protection under the law. This principle challenged Plessy, though what was established in this case concerning discrimination against Mexican Americans would not become law until the Brown decision three years later. In retrospect, the decision "uncolored" the Mexican but categorized him/her under the "other white" category. When Brown came into effect, Hispanics were perceived as neither black nor white. In fact, this interpretation later came to haunt desegregation efforts among Hispanics.

It is obvious that Hispanics have been systematically treated as a distinct racial group and, at times, benefitting from neither black legal precedents nor white statutes. As a unique entity, it suffered greatly from a lack of definition and legal consistency. This is nowhere different in the eighties when Hispanics are variously defined as white, black, brown, or other.

## Research on School Desegregation

The effects of desegregation have too often been viewed in terms of the harm-benefit perspective. Whether the benefits derived from school desegregation justify the effort should not be at issue; nor should it be assessed from that vantage point.

Our review of the fesearch literature proved enlightening but disappointing. While it soon became obvious that desegregation was not causing harm, in many cases beneficial to everyone involved, it was disappointing to observe the politicization of the research process. In addition, the state of school

desegregation research still left much to be desired vis-a-vis non-black minority groups. Also, most studies of school desegregation limit themselves to the school district as a whole, while evidence suggests that research must also focus on the schools and classrooms. Furthermore, school desegregation is seldom evaluated beyond the transitional year. In brief, much of the past research on school desegregation has been achievement oriented and rather limited to traditional issues and methods of approach.

Research in this area is slowly beginning to raise further questions about the impact of desegregated schools on community integration, interracial attitudes, career orientation, and later occupational advancement, as well as examine the impact these pre-existing conditions may have on school desegregation.

In 1952 a group of social scientists headed by Dr. Kenneth Clark produced a brief in support of Brown. As it turned out, Brown needed little help from social science evidence. The Brown decision did not include findings about academic achievement, nor a promise of better test scores. Since that time, more sophisticated measures have been introduced to further document those basic propositions so inherently obvious. After cursory comparison between the 1952 brief to one recently filed by another illustrous group of social scientists in the Columbus (1979) case, surprisingly little illumination from social science was evident after 27 years. Although literature has abounded during this period, it has not changed the state of the art. In fact, some would argue that for the most part, "the improvement of research on social policy does not lead to greater clarity about what to think or what to do. Instead, it usually tends to produce a greater sense of complexity."[2]

It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that a better use of social science in future school litigation should not be based on the benefits of desegregation, but on how to facilitate and improve desegregated education.

---

[2]David Cohen and Janet Weiss, quoted in Education, Social Science, and the Judicial Process, 1977, p. 73.

## Background

In studying the educational system in America we find a microcosm of this society's structure and how it operates. Our study explored how various branches of the Federal Government, as well as local governments, affect school policies. At the same time, we examined how educational systems and influential community members can have effects on particular racial and national origin groups.

In looking at Hispanics, data provides sufficient evidence of a continued process of dual (or triadic) systems of education with respect to racial groupings. Our historical analysis, critical review of the literature, and ethnographic and statistical reports indicate that racial stratification generates and sustains Hispanic school failure. Furthermore, Hispanic racial stratification, viewed historically, has been maintained systematically by dominant whites through legal and extralegal mechanisms since the entrance of Puerto Rico and the Mexican territories to the U.S. in the 19th century.

## II. HISPANIC SEGREGATION TRENDS

While it is difficult to concisely summarize our completed study, it is fair to say that we tackled many issues through both qualitative and quantitative research methods by combining case study methodology with that of descriptive numerical analyses.

### Description of the Study

Our study examined within-district segregation of Hispanics in public elementary and secondary school districts between 1968 and 1976. Segregation in the nation as a whole, in regions, and in school districts having large Hispanic enrollment was examined by using several indices of segregation. The apparent effects of segregation on a variety of school practices were examined, and the relationship between segregation of Hispanics and segregation of blacks was explored.

Previous segregation studies primarily concentrated on segregation of blacks or all minorities as a group. Studies that examined segregation of Hispanos were limited by small sample size or use of only one measure of segregation. This study concentrated on various indices of segregation of Hispanics and used large samples; thus the findings comprehensively represent the environment of the "average" Hispanic student in the nation's public schools. In addition, a variety of measures were used so that various forms of segregation and a variety of policy issues could be evaluated.

The elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey conducted by the Office for Civil Rights have provided a wealth of information about school practices and special programs, but analyses of these data rarely have considered the relationship between segregation and these practices.

In addition, studies of segregation of specific minority groups rarely have explored the relationship between segregation of one group and desegregation of another. Does desegregation of blacks, for example, affect desegregation of Hispanics? Under what circumstances? This study provided for direct

comparison of segregation of blacks and segregation of Hispanics, and the apparent effects of desegregation of one group on the other.

## Sample Populations

The study involved five sample populations of school districts, each the subset of the larger, derived from the OCR biennial, elementary and secondary school surveys at the district and school level (OSCR 101 and 102) for the years 1968, 1972 and 1976. The folllwing five types of samples were selected:

Samples 1 and 2:

all school districts with enrollments exceeding 3,000 and with 5% Hispanic population or above for each of the years 1968, 1972, and 1976. The analyses involved a) cross-sectional analyses for each of three years above (n 600), and b) longitudinal examination for districts in OCR data base with data in each of these years (n = 247);

Sample 3:

a purposive sample of the ten largest school districts in the country (all but one lie within the above category);

Sample 4:

a select sample of 20 tri-ethnic school districts geographically representative of the larger sample;

Sample 5:

two ethnographic case studies of an East and West Coast district designated as Eastville and Westville.

## Data Gathered

Inasmuch as the large sample of school districts (sample 1) included nearly 80% of all Hispanic students in the country, it was treated as a census. Yet, these school districts represented less than 5% of the nation's school districts. Hispanics (1976) were the single largest minority group for all the districts in our study, representing 23% of the total student population of these districts. This sample (and sample 2) supported the quantitative analyses of survey responses in the areas of English language instruction; special education programs; discipline, as measured by rates of suspensions and expulsions; grade retention, as measured by rates of high school graduation and number of dropouts; and staffing patterns. The third and fourth samples were also quantitatively determined, while the ethnographic cases (sample 5) lent themselves to careful on-site participant observation and archival documentation.

## Segregation Trends for Hispanics

Hispanic students comprise the third largest racial group in the nation's schools (100%). Hispanics are highly segregated between school systems: in 1976, nearly 80% of all Hispanics in the nation's schools were enrolled in fewer than 5% of the nation's school districts.[3] These same school systems enrolled fewer than one-fourth of all students in the nation. Furthermore, Hispanics were, in 1976, the single largest minority group in these districts (n = 600), representing 23% of the total student population. These Hispanic students were somewhat younger than either black or white students in these systems. Hence, if present trends continue, larger proportions of all Hispanic students will be enrolled in this small group of districts with smaller proportions of all other-race students.

In addition to this high level of segregation between school systems, Hispanics have experienced segregation between schools within school districts. Within-school segregation of Hispanics may increase in

[3]This level of segregation between school systems is nearly twice the level for blacks in 1976.

the near future due to population figures which indicated a greater gross reproduction rate among Hispanics than for blacks or whites, and due to the increasing mobility of whites away from these same school districts. (Hispanic segregation in elementary schools is more severe than in secondary schools because elementary schools serve more restricted areas and because school officials have been more reluctant to desegregate elementary schools than higher level schools.) As the somewhat younger Hispanic student population progresses through the grades, secondary schools may also experience higher levels of segregation.

Hispanics are isolated from whites in both elementary and secondary schools. In 1968, 65% of all Hispanic elementary schools students and 53% of all Hispanic secondary school students were in predominantly minority schools.[4] By 1976 this had risen to 74% in elementary schools and 65% in secondary schools. As the number of white students in the schools continues to decrease and the number of minority students to increase, the proportions of Hispanics in predominantly minority schools will consequently increase.

Another measure of segregation, accounting for the loss of white students from the schools, portrays a somewhat different picture of Hispanic segregation from whites: Hispanic segregation barely decreased from 1968 to 1976, with most of the decrease occurring the early part of this time period. This index is measured by the proportions of whites in school with the average Hispanic child relative to the entire proportion of whites in the school system.[5] This relative measure of segregation from whites barely indicates desegregation of Hispanics and has been greatly lessening. Projections from the last eight years predicts increased segregation in the near future.

---

[4]These are schools in which minority group children constitute 50% or or more of the enrollment.

[5]Though the average level of segregation of Hispanics, when using this relative measure has declined slightly due to the substantial increase in Hispanic enrollment, the actual number (and relative percentage) of Hispanics in highly segregated districts has increased.

Segregation of Hispanics from blacks in 1976 (by any measure) exceeded segregation in 1968, even after compensating for the proportion of blacks in the school systems. And present projections indicate that Hispanic segregation from blacks will probably continue to increase.

## Relationship Between Segregation and School Practices

One of the principal reasons for concern about segregation in the public schools is the belief that minority groups in segregated systems do not receive equal treatment. Our study addressed this concern by examining the relationship between level of segregation of Hispanics (between schools in a school system) and Hispanic participation for several school programs, practices, and educational outcomes. These include: participation in English language instruction; special education programs; discipline, as measured by rates of suspension and expulsion; grade retention as measured by rates of high school graduation and number of dropouts; and staffing patterns.

The study found some modest relationships between level of segregation and participation in some school practices. However, the analysis performed did not address the strength of the relationship nor control for other characteristics of the school systems that could be significant for participation in the programs. Thus, although relationships were found, the analysis will not support a finding that segregation is the sole factor nor necessarily a significant factor in determining participation in the school practices examined.[6]

## Bilingual Education and Desegregation

In speaking about the interface of the Hispanic community and desegregation, we must guard against overly simplistic assumptions that the Hispanic community, as a racial and national origin group, is coterminous with the bilingual community. Inasmuch as a small percentage of our Hispanic community is bilingual, simply documenting the effects of school

[6]Although the date are available, insufficient funding and time prohibited additional needed research.

desegregation on bilingual education and ESL programs not only misses most of our community, but clouds other analysis focused on the issues.

Language Instruction

Students who may need bilingual education or programs in English as a second language (ESL) are more likely to participate in these programs in highly segregated school systems. Nationwide, more than one-fourth of all Hispanic students may have limited English speaking ability (LESA) which is inferred from the use of a language other than English at home. (Fewer than 2% of all non-Hispanic students also had non-English backgrounds.) Nearly 84% of all LESA students are Hispanics; while 47% of Hispanics (LESA) receive some form of special language instruction (either bilingual education or ESL) in low segregated districts. These figures increased with the level of segregation: in relatively high segregated systems, 57% of the Hispanics who may need special language instruction received the instruction. From this data, it appears that segregated districts are more likely to offer special language programs, serve as an incentive for implementing these programs, and facilitate the provision of these programs.

Special Education

Racial, cutural, and language differences between minorities and non-minorities may cause inappropriate and disproportionate numbers of minorities to be identified as handicapped, particularly in school systems where minorities are not segregated. If this were a significant problem for Hispanics, the reported incidence of a handicapped condition among Hispanics would be higher than the incidence among non-Hispanics in less segregated school systems. When special education programs as a group are considered, there appears to be some evidence of this problem, but only in districts having relatively low levels of segregation.

The reported incidence of mental retardation (whether educable or trainable) for Hispanics exceeded that for non-Hispanics in less segregated school systems, while the incidence of specific learning disabilities for Hispanics exceeded that for non-Hispanics in school systems having both relatively high and relatively low levels of segregation. Since these

same school systems have somewhat lower incidence of identified language difficulties than do moderately segregated systems, there may be some confusion of language problems with specific learning disabilities.

For all other reported handicap conditions, participation in programs among Hispanics consistently differed from the participation among non-Hispanics at all levels of segregation (higher in physical/sensory or health related programs, and lower in programs for psychological or emotional handicaps and for gifted/talented students).

Segregation may affect the delivery of special education services to the various racial groups differently. And since service delivery problems affect the identification and assessment of handicaps, and the provision of special education, the reported incidence of handicap conditions by level of segregation could vary between minorities and non-minorities. There was some evidence of these problems for the nation as a whole: the reported incidence of mental retardation varied differently for Hispanics and non-Hispanics by level of segregation. Incidence for non-Hispanics increased with increasing segregation, but among Hispanics the greatest incidence occurred in school systems having relatively moderate levels of segregation. The drop of incidence in more highly segregated systems may have resulted from service delivery problems in these systems. However, since moderately segregated systems had higher proportions of Hispanics with language problems than did districts having lower or higher levels of segregation, this also may have been a result of confounding language problems with actual mental retardation.

Discipline

The proportion of Hispanics suspended was lower than the proportion of non-Hispanics suspended regardless of the level of segregation. However, the variation in suspension rates by level of segregation differed for Hispanics and non-Hispanics. For both groups, the lowest rates occurred in highly segregated districts. However, Hispanic suspension rates were highest in moderately segregated systems while non-Hispanic rates were highest in less segregated systems. Since moderately segregated districts

had the highest proportion of Hispanics with language problems, this suggests that cultural differences may be construed as behavorial problems that require mild disciplinary action. Alternately, the language differences may have increased interracial strife among students, leading to mild disciplinary action.

Grade Retention

If desegregation improves the education provided in a school system, measures of educational outcome should also improve. It is usually assumed that in a desegregated system the educational environment is better and that this will result in lower rates of retention in grade and dropping out and higher rates of graduation from high school. However, if the segregated environment leads to an increase in disciplinary problems or a feeling of alienation and discrimination, dropout rates may increase.

Rates of retention in grade were generally higher for Hispanics. Moreover, while non-Hispanic retention accelerated with increased segregation, Hispanic retention was highest in moderately segregated school systems. This suggests that, in general, desegregation improves retention rates. For Hispanics, the improvement in retention from desegregation may be overshadowed by the effect of language differences, common to Hispanics in moderately segregated districts. High school graduation rates generally were lower for Hispanics than for non-Hispanics. Yet, rates improved for both groups as segregation decreased. Hence, desegregation may have a beneficial effect on educational outcomes in that larger proportions of students complete secondary education and graduate in less segregated systems.

Dropout rates, however, appear to be adversely affected by desegregation: the relatively more segregated school system had somewhat lower dropout rates. This was particularly true for Hispanics - only in the highly segregated school systems were dropout rates for Hispanics lower than those for non-Hispanics. At the same time, the rates for both groups were higher in moderately segregated systems. This suggests that increased interracial strife, or the different nature of the school environment, may produce

feelings of alienation or discrimination which lead to a higher dropout proportion. This follows a similar pattern to suspension rates.

Staffing

The presence of Hispanic professional staff is important for Hispanic students. Hispanic staff may provide role models for students, which may lead to fewer behavorial problems and increased desire to complete school. In addition, the presence of Hispanic staff can help reduce feelings of alienation and/or discrimination among Hispanic students.

This study examined the location of Hispanic staff with respect to the location of Hispanic students by level of segregation in the school systems. When aggregate figures by level of segregation are considered, the higher numbers and proportions of Hispanic staff were generally found where there were higher numbers and proportions of Hispanic students. Moreover, higher proportion of Hispanic staff were found in school systems that, in aggregate, had more active programs for bilingual education or English as a second language. Although this may be beneficial for bilingual (or ESL) and other special programs, it also indicates separation of Hispanic staff from non-Hispanic instructors.

Comparison of Hispanic and Black Segregation Trends

Comparison of segregation of blacks and segregation of Hispanics highlights differences in the history and focus of segregation for blacks and Hispanics. Blacks are more segregated than Hispanics between schools and across school systems, but segregation of blacks has decreased more (or increased less) than segregation of Hispanics in the school systems.

There are indications that the desegregation of black students has adversely affected segregation of Hispanic students. The concentration on desegregation of blacks and whites has led to increased segregation of Hispanics. By addressing one social ill to the exclusion of other groups of students, the nation has indirectly suffered increased segregation of Hispanic students.

## III. CASE STUDIES

Little attention has been paid to the effect of school desegregation on the nation's other minority groups. As indicated, Hispanics have been fighting school segregation in the nation's courts since before Brown. The ethnographic case studies, part of the larger study on Hispanic segregation trends, represents a step toward broader understanding of desegregation as an issue of vital importance to Hispanic communities.

The two ethnographic studies reported are the result of four months of field work. The sites selected were Westville and Eastville.[7] The purpose of these case studies was to document the desegregation process and the impact of school desegregation on the Hispanic community. In each site the school system and the desegregation process were studied in light of the entire community and its dynamics. Data on a wide range of related issues were collected, and observations were carried out at many levels of interaction. Because of this ethnographic approach, a relatively short period of field work yielded a rich and wide-ranging understanding of important variables affecting the desegregation process and its impact on the Hispanic population.

Educational change invariably occurs in a political context, and when there are several racial groups involved, the course of educational policies and programs are strongly affected by special interests, usually racially based.

### Ethnographic Case Study Procedures

#### District Site Selection Criteria and Procedures

For maximum comparability of data, selected sites had to have similar demographic features and nearly parallel development in desegregation

[7] To protect the confidentiality of our aites, pseudonyms were used. School district represenatives who authorized site entry into one of the school districts requested district anonymity for Eastville.

litigation and implementation. Consequently, the following general parameters guided the selection of the case study sites.

1) The school district had to be in the second year of implementation of a State or Federal court-order to desegregate.

2) The school district had to enroll 15%-30% Hispanic students and substantial percentages of black and other minority students, but black enrollment could not exceed 30%.

3) The school district had to represent a tri-ethnic community with a large presence of black and white students; however, total minority enrollment could not exceed much more than 50% of the district enrollment.

4) School district enrollment had to be between 20,000 and 150,000 students.

5) One site had to be from the East and one from the West or Southwest.

Numerous sites met these criteria. The sites selected represented the greatest variability in Hispanic population and had been suggested as exemplary cases of successful implementation of court-ordered desegregation. One site was on the East Coast (Eastville), the other on the West Coast (Westville).[8]

For each district chosen for study, a sample of three or four elementary schools was selected for detailed analyses. In Westville, where full implementation of desegregation coincided with full implementation of bilingual education, it was appropriate to choose a sample that would represent the range of possible bilingual programs (full, partial, and individualized). Change in Hispanic enrollment at the sampled schools from before to after desegregation varied--from almost no change to a change of 30%. Change in the number of NES/LESA (Non-English speaking and limited English speaking ability) students also varied--from declining by one-half to increasing tenfold. (See Table I.)

---

[8]For purposes of anonymity and easy site entry, confidentiality had to be maintained.

TABLE I

Hispanic Population and NES/LESA Students in Sample Schools in the Westville Unified School District

| | Percent Hispanic Population | | Number of NES/LES Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School | 1976 | 1978 | 1976 | 1978 |
| 1 | 47 | 50 | 22 | 32 |
| 2 | 49 | 48 | 105 | 55 |
| 3 | 11 | 40 | 6 | 60 |
| 4 | 20 | 37 | 13 | 35 |

SOURCE: Ethnic/Racial Reports, 1976 and 1978. Office of Research, Westville Board of Education.

In Westville, four schools were selected to reveal the history of bilingual education and the changes it underwent in the desegregation process, and to facilitate an understanding of the actual mechanics of the different types of bilingual education formats. A magnet school designated as a multilingual/multicultural school, a set of paired elementary schools, and a K-6 neighborhood school were selected.

In Eastville, three elementary schools were selected--one that had been very little affected by the school desegregation plan, one moderately affected, and one not significantly affected by the desegregation plan.

While the criteria for school selection varied slightly between the two districts, selected schools represented a wide spectrum of bilingual educational instruction and were located in different sectors of the school system--some of these schools were consequently more directly affected by desegregation efforts than others.

## Data Collection Strategies

Participant observation was used extensively as a data-gathering technique. In addition, structured and open-ended interviews were conducted with community and school participants--administrators, board members, community leaders, and parents. School board meetings, parent advisory councils, and community meetings were attended. Within each sampled school, one administrator, one or more bilingual aides, three or more teachers, at least three students and three parents, and a school counselor were interviewed using a structured format.

Prior to field entry, extensive interviews were held with individuals who were known to have extensive experience and knowledge about the selected district. In some cases, interviewees had conducted major investigations in these districts. A review of the relevant literature was conducted. All available documents (e.g., newspapers, published and unpublished studies, school reports) pertaining to the history of desegregation and/or bilingual education in the district were also reviewed, as were census reports and city planning studies.

## Findings

The cites in this study are a microcosm of cities across the country. Discriminatory employment and hiring practices, unequal access to important social and economic resources, and residential segregation were clearly evident.

Through the years, the white majority has maintained consistent and firm control over the economic, political, social, and educational resources of both Eastville and Westville. Access to educational resources by different self-identified ethnic groups has generated a great deal of conflict in these cities. When conflict is not very intense, negotiation between competing racial groups is possible and mutually agreeable solutions can result. When racial conflict intensifies, negotiations usually fail and the courts are likely to be called to settle disputes.

The study of these two districts found that:

- Loss in white enrollment in Eastville schools coincided with full implementation of the state ordered desegregation plan. This could be due to the impact of the desegregation plan and/or increased economic status of whites enabling them to move into more affluent areas not affected by the desegregation plan. Whichever the case, direct conflict is avoided by the perpetuation of separateness. In Westville, the school population dropped from 1969 to 1978 with the major loss (95%) being majority students. While this trend is not new, or solely associated with the court order to desegregate the public schools intensified the dominant move out of the Westville Unified School Districts (WUSD).

- Racial cleavage increased in both sites soon after school desegregation was implemented. In Eastville, for instance, Hispanic and white students isolated themselves during recess and lunch periods. The tendency was also for Hispanic students to use Spanish during recess to communicate among themselves.

- Racial conflict increased in both Westville and Eastville when majority teachers came into closer contact with minority students due to desegregation plans. A number of these teachers were unwilling particpants in the desegregation process and expressed hostility toward minority students. In Westville, our study found instances of heightened ethnic conflict within the schools. In junior and senior high schools this was manifested by fights, racial slurs between groups, and a considerable amount of racial grouping and voluntary segregation. The formation of one Westville elementary school was brought about by combining one formerly black school, and one Hispanic low income housing project school with a predominantly white northern school. A marked degree of racial conflict resulted.

- Limited Hispanic community participation and acceptance of desegregation eventually came about through an understanding of the desegregation process. In most instances, Hispanic disapproval paralleled the degree of ignorance about the plan. This was heightened by sensationalism, poor coverage in the local media, and school officials' unfounded fears about the outcomes of desegregation. This situation did not simply result from lack of language communication, but through lack of efforts to go beyond the leaders of the Hispanic community and into people's homes. Grass-roots organizations were many times not very grass-roots oriented.

- Court-ordered desegregation plans at times curtailed specially targeted minority programs. Programs, such as bilingual education and early childhood education, can be harmed because, to a large degree, they depend on a critical mass of students in schools to meet Federal guidelines for continued funding. If students who meet such guidelines are dispersed to schools which do not qualify for such programs, it becomes economically difficult and sometimes logistically unfeasible for them to receive special services. The Eastville desegregation plan, because of its weakness, negatively affected bilingual education and many of the other programs targeted

for minority or low income students. It could be more strongly argued that in Westville the desegregation plan enhanced bilingual education because in that plan the Board of Education reaffirmed moral and financial support for bilingual education.[9]

- Majority-dominated school systems have good reason to support bilingual education programs. First, by concentrating bilingual education in predominately white schools, Hispanic desire to attend white schools is dampened. Second, the white community can more easily support bilingual education because they see it as a way to keep Latinos segregated in their own schools.

- The educational practice of tracking students into performance levels based on test scores, has been used by some schools which have recently integrated. Minorities tend to fall behind their white counterparts in academic subjects as a result of transferring from a minority school with a poor academic environment. Test scores are used to separate students into different classrooms resulting in the separation of minorites from whites in class, even though as a whole, the school is racially balanced.[10] Although this method of segregation by tracking is difficult to check by homeroom enrollments alone, since students attend various classes during the day, pullout programs were more common in desegregated settings.

- Racially balanced student reallocation procedures met with greater success. In Westville there was a more widespread effort on the part of the district to improve the quality of education, post-desegregation, by equalizing facilities and course offerings. This is particularly evident at the high school level, where during the pre-desegregation period there were many more courses offered at the Northern school than at the Southern school. This phenomenon is in part due to the fact that pairing of schools brings white children into schools with poorer facilities and inferior curricula. This situation seems to be more likely when minority and non-minority children equally share in student reallocation and busing plans. This was more likely in Westville as compared to Eastville.

---

[9] It must be emphasized that in Westville, while some outcomes of the desegregation plan were beneficial to bilingual education others were rather detrimental. Within the neighborhood K-6 schools, not enough attention was given to achieving a sufficient concentration of NES/LESA students at each grade level. As a result, the NES/LESA students within these schools are less than ten per grade level and receive only minimal bilingual education. Additionally, the site chosen for a magnet school was a would-be abandoned school, which was provided with inadequate materials and there was little consideration to continuing bilingual education of these students beyond the sixth grade. The desegregation plan had a beneficial outcome in that it resulted in the development of a multicultural/multilingual education for both NES/LESA minorities and fluent English speakers was undermined by a lack of administrative commitment.

[10] Although there is legal sanction against action of this nature, the practice continues.

- The acquisition of community political pwoer preceded educational change. The Hispanic minority constituencies studies had not yet acquired the necessary power to be in a position to negotiate. In both communities, coalitions were formed with other groups (primarily blacks) which eventually became a form of community power. This was used to acquire needed educational change. Although, in many instances, change came about through heated negotiations and conflict, it seldom occurred without some combined group power.

## Summary of Major Findings and Conclusions

Within the two school systems selected for in-depth analysis, it does not appear that school desegregation led white administrators or teachers to a greater understanding about the Hispanic community. It is clear that racist stereotypes remain common. It can be postulated that any city forced to desegregate schools by court order is a city wherein the dominant majority does not respect or accept minority racial cultures. At the same time, it is not clear to what extent these attitudes and values will be altered, in the long run, by school desegregation.

## Conclusions

The following conclusions were derived from the two ethnographic case studies:

- School desegregation plans should distinguish the needs of blacks from those of Hispanics, as well as from those of other racial minorities.
- Desegregation plans should adhere to existing State and Federal guidelines for bilingual education. An attempt should be made to avoid dispersal of NES/LESA students to such an extent that bilingual education at each grade level is rendered economically impractical.
- With desegregation, Hispanic students are less likely to come into contact with a supportive learning environment. In many cases

this should imply the hiring of additional Hispanic staff, rather than the further segregation of limited Hispanic staff.[11]

- Different socio-economic sectors of the Hispanic community respond in varying ways to desegregation. Hispanic response also varies among many low income Hispanics who either mildly oppose initial desegregation or are totally uninvolved with the issue. If parents understand the inequities of a segregated educational system, they are more likely to actively support desegregation.

- In many cities, Hispanics perceive that desegregation may prove to be detrimental to bilingual education. These perceptions are born of realities as desegregation, at times, is used as an excuse to limit the service of special educational needs of Hispanics. The degree to which parents feel that such will occur influences their view toward desegregation.

## Recommendations for Further Study Based on Case Studies

Much more research is needed on the effects of desegregation on bilingual education. In particular, a broad cross-site assessment should be done of bilingual programs and how they are affected by the different desegregation processes. The most common problems of bilingual education in desegregated settings need to be outlined and solutions systematically sought.

The issue of how desegregation affects quality of education and educational achievement requires an approach that identifies the needs of the Hispanic population. The special educational needs of Hispanics can no longer be limited to purely linguistic needs. Schools need to promote broader acceptance of cultural pluralism and remediate the prejudicial treatment of minority students. Quality of education and educational achievement cannot be solely measured on the basis of standardized tests.

---

[11] Desegregation many times increases Hispanic student contact with white teachers and staff, some of whom do not favor desegregation and who hold stereotypic views of Hispanics, while also decreasing contact with Hispanic teachers. It is important that Hispanic students be exposed to Hispanic teachers and administrators. At the most basic level, it is essential that school personnel be able to fully communicate with students in their native language. Further, it is important to the education of Spanish speaking children that the school not represent an alien situation where they are continually exposed to unfamiliar cultural expectations. Teachers and administrators from the same group help bridge this gap and lessen the degree of cultural conflict experienced by the Spanish speaking students with Anglo dominated school systems. Also implicit in this notion is that students of a given racial/linguistic group need role models with whom they can easily identify.

Continued research should be carried out on the role of majority teacher/administrator attitudes in minority student achievement. Factors such as the provision of Hispanic teachers and administrators and their effect on minority student achievement need to be more fully explored.

There should be continued analyses of the ways in which our socio-economic system promotes and, in some cases, benefits from racial conflict and cleavage. Local minority pressure is enhanced through non-locally controlled institutions. Outside sources of funds facilitate the creation of external support systems to combat local power blocks. Also, the courts operate somewhat independently of local politics. These procedures can assist in bringing about needed educational reform.

## IV. GENERAL FINDINGS

We have seen in case after case that some school boards go to incredible lengths to circumvent and undermine the desegregation process. In Houston and Austin, for example, where Hispanics and Blacks had been isolated residentially, occupationally, and in the schools, the court battles were long and hard. The caste system seemed to have been imprinted indelibly in the minds of the defending school board members. But even worse, the desegregation plans obviously devised to maintain and reify ethnic boundaries, were accepted by the district courts and affirmed by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

While some information on community context can be gleaned from the court cases and culled from the literature, neither source provides adequate information about the impact of desegregation on Hispanics and Hispanic communities. A more complete picture of the overall situation emerges from our OCR (1968-76) survey analyses and ethnographic field data. The OCR data yielded considerable information at the national, regional, and state levels about the range of school practices and their relationship to the level of segregation, as well as information on district and within-school isolation, and current segregation trends in school districts with large Hispanic population.

The field research has allowed us to trace the course of racial conflict and cleavage and the nature of group relationships in the community through time, in much greater depth than that allowed by other forms of research. The fieldworkers studied the dynamics of ethnic conflict and cleavage as it structured community context variables, affected the educational system, and erupted in the courts. Delving still deeper, on-site research yielded rich information on the attitudes of the people involved in the desegregation process and clearly illustrated the way in which racial conflict and cleavage forged those attitudinal patterns.

What are the factors which mold the attitudes of students, teachers, staff, administrators? What are the attitudes of the parents in the barrios? In the Inner-city slums? In the white suburbs? And, what

effect is desegregation having on those long held attitudes? Only through intensive field research can we begin to understand some of the processes upon which the success of desegregation efforts hinge. Some of the marked differences between our two sites, Westville and Eastville, will be briefly sketched to highlight the correlation between community context variables, as they are shaped by racial conflict and cleavage and the types of battles over desegregation waged with their differential successes and failures.

If one looks rather cursorily at the Hispanic situation in Westville and Eastville, there are enough similarities to tempt generalization. The communities are roughly the same size, each with a similar size of Hispanic population and with proportionately equal Black constituencies. In both cases, Hispanic unemployment rate is higher than that for whites and higher than that for the community overall; Hispanics are in low-status unskilled occupations; and the educational attainment of the Hispanic is below that for whites. It is also true that in each instance Hispanics tend to be centered in ethnically distinct neighborhoods.

The differences are also striking. One community is on the West Coast, while the other is in the East. The former is primarily composed of Mexican American (Chicano) Hispanics; the latter has a high Puerto Rican percentage among its Hispanic population. At the same time, the Chicano population has remained relatively unchanged after one century, while the majority of Puerto Ricans have arrived since 1960.

Overall, segregation has not greatly diminished for Hispanics in either community during the past eight years. In fact, OCR statistics indicate that since 1968, Hispanic segregation has increased in nearly half the school districts in the nation. Furthermore, in districts which have desegregated, Hispanic classroom isolation has replaced the de facto minority school. In addition, evidence indicates that bilingual education has been misused, by many districts, as a tool to combat the efforts of a desegregated system.

Inconsistency abounds in other school districts over the classification of Hispanic as either "white," "black," or "other," as majority or minority. Confusion rests in those tri-ethnic districts where blacks and Hispanics can racially balance a school. Although we were informed the practice was

not widespread, we found this to be the case in several school districts.[12]

The process of desegregation continues to occur with little parental inclusion. Our case studies indicate that even when parental groups met with district administrators, parental participation was a sham. Overall, parents were given a minimal amount of information about desegregation. Even inservice efforts with parents have not met with major success, more greatly due to poor programs than parent responsiveness. Among Hispanics, nearly half the parents are unaware of what is going on and many of those who are have grave misconceptions about desegregation.

Teachers, like parents, are also uninformed about local school district plans. Their attitude is either one of maximum disinterest, if not directly affected, or strong hostility when desegregation has affected their job. Surprisingly, teacher hostility seemed to increase the second year of desegregation in one of our ethnographic sites. (See Volume II.)

Federal court ordered plans were, on the whole, more comprehensive than locally devised plans and state plans. Ironically, many plans which defer to parent initiative (e.g., voluntary transfer plans) affect minority groups the least. Among Hispanics, limited English speaking ability students benefitted least, although they attended the most segregated schools.

Our findings indicate that where the dominant community forces are against desegregation, there is a continual affinity for bilingual education. In fact, the power strategy has neutralized Hispanic support for desegregation by offering bilingual education as a viable option. This was especially effective in Eastville where it clearly offset Hispanic demands for desegregation. Hispanics became disinterested in desegregation when bilingual education was not offered in predominantly white schools. Hispanics lost interest in these schools and withdrew from the desegregation battle. This ploy continues to keep Hispanic segregation a reality. In fact, Eastville perpetuated the myth that desegregation, if enacted, would surely result in the loss of bilingual funds.

---

[12] See discussion of ethnographic reports, Volume II.

Our study found that loss of funds for bilingual education is not a necessary outcome; and it was not true in Eastville. The impact of desegregation on bilingual education is varied, even within a desegregated district. In Westville, for instance, the pairing of schools increased the number of limited English speaking students for K-3 and 4-6 grade schools, but limited this group in K-6 schools, due to a loss of LESA concentration for each grade level. The effects are also mixed for magnet schools, exemplary schools, triadic schools, and other types of desegregated schools. Since remedies have seldom included the interests of Hispanic students within the context of desegregation, in these instances, the results will at times increase, while at other times severely decrease the critical number of students needed to implement even a limited program. Student allocation plans can therefore seriously jeopardize bilingual programs if the allocation process does not enforce the minimal requisite for the conduct of bilingual instruction in compliance with the LAU provisions.

In the context of bilingual education the ethnic/racial hostility toward desegregation is also demonstrated against bilingual education. However, it is not as overt in bilingual education since white society seems most supportive of bilingual efforts when bilingual education is translated into "separate" education for Hispanics.

It is important to note that bilingual education is more strongly supported by Hispanic communities recently arrived in the States. That is, those communities with large LESA population groups are more inclined toward bilingual education for their children. A community with a language difficulty will more actively seek to relieve the language barrier. Bilingual education also assists the LESA community by offering it an important vehicle toward entry into the occupational structure of the society. On the other hand, established Hispanic communities are more likely to perceive bilingual education as a hindrance, as an indelible reminder of their heritage which must be shed to more easily melt into the American pot.

In this respect, the older Hispanic community is also cast into a more fixed position within its society. The separation among groups is well

understood and rigidly enforced. Racial cleavage, as in Westville, can be well protected by residential covenants and laws forbidding intermarriage (until recently). Such a segregated structure is strongly resistant to change and boundary maintenance is not easily surrendered without violence.

A recently arrived population, such as that of Eastville, can be easily kindled by violence because its boundaries have not been rigidly cast. Since it has not obtained a stable relationship with the dominant group, it neither knows the ropes nor the political structure. Resolution of conflict will assist its struggle for recognition and position within the larger society.

Overt conflict was more strongly demonstrated in the high school. Having larger enrollments, these schools also contained a greater student mixture than neighborhood schools. Our onsite studies indicated that open conflict was minimized through carefully implemented desegregation procedures. However, poorly devised, weak plans also tended to dissipate conflict. Some of the most rigid plans have engendered major conflict. Among these latter plans, student hostility and white flight reduced considerably after the first year of school desegregation. In fact, open hostility dissipated conflict in subsequent years.

On the legal battlefield, the strongly entrenched community can more easily prove de jure segregation, while its counterpart remains de facto. It will also create a formidable legal challenge and possibly a more complex legal battle than is otherwise the case.

Regarding black and white desegregation, we suspect our generalizations will still hold true. In a tri-ethnic community, however, "black" participation in the desegregation process may overshadow "brown" participation. In such cases our generalizations may not always be true. Hispanic participation may be minimal and its effect on the larger white community may be limited.

As a whole, desegregation has increased equalization of resources in many impoverished schools throughout the country for both blacks and Hispanics.

Additional Comments

Many myths abound regarding school desegregation, some of which concern desegregation, in general, and some of which are specific to Hispanics. Our case studies highlighted the fact that good desegregation plans, in fact, the best plans, increased community conflict. And the more polarized the community, the greater the intensity of the conflict. At the same time, it is true that these plans more quickly enhanced racial relations. Social change of the type brought about through desegregation affects all aspects of community life. Prominent court orders are more likely to disrupt this state than mediocre, and oftentimes, compromised voluntary remedies. The findings seem to suggest, although this was not demonstrated conclusively, that mediocre plans which minimize conflict in the short run tend to continue in social turmoil for a long time until, in the long run, overt conflict prevails.

The extent of conflict is more related to community history of racial cleavage and comprehensiveness and rigidness of school desegregation plans than all other factors combined.

School desegregation can be accomplished in the most racially strife cities in the country. It requires an inordinate amount of planning and preparedness before implementation. Large community involvement must be present at all stages of the process, from the inception of the design to full implementation and later collaboration with the school system. The amount of money required to undertake education change is certainly dependent on the comprehensiveness of the plan, but in no way is it as financially unfeasible as is widely presumed. Even busing, widely claimed to be the most expensive undertaking, accounts for a small percentage of a school district's total budget. Procrastination and legal delays in school desegregation only serve to increase general anxiety over impending desegregation; and, in some instances, allows time for community cleavage and mobilization to take firm root. White flight is but one phenomenon; and one of the more easily documented.

The courts have not upheld consistent rulings. Confusion and vacillation seems to increase the amount of litigation and further confounds the issues. Absence of legal enforcement obviates the work of the courts. Executive intervention and Congressional overruling creates an unwieldy and effete record of progress. An examination of this interplay reveals more the confusion and inept procedures within Federal and local governments than malicious intent, although a fair amount of the latter is also present.

Americans largely support desegregation. But their support stops short of personal action. The connection between the mores and behavior is still a rather weak link. This is more the case when organized resistance and misinformation is rampant. Behavioral change against deep seated convictions must be legislated into action, not circumvented.

Major advances in school desegregation have occurred the last fifteen years, but much of this action has laid dormant the past decade. Advancement in school desegregation is lagging. Present rates do not indicate a very fast changing future. As it concerns Hispanics, desegregation has remained virtually still since 1968, when the first national statistics were available.

Problems of school desegregation are not based on busing, high cost factors, poor white school achievement, de facto v. de jure segregation, majority resistance to desegregation, or even white flights. As we have seen, many of these are spurious to the arguments over school desegregation. What is more significant is the effectiveness of court ordered plans versus voluntary ones, history of community separateness and ethical/racial conflict, extent of community participation and influence in the process of school desegregation, types of remedies proposed, and impact on different ethnic/racial groups.

Though much social changes comes about through conflict, it usually occurs after the acquisition or semblance of power. Newly gained minority power frequently translates into instructional change, including educational change, both in the structure of the institution and the position minority groups occupy within.

Local pressure is further enhanced through non-locally controlled institutions and the Federal government. Furthermore, outside sources of funds assist in the creation of external support systems to combat local power blocs. Although minority groups are seldom allowed to acquire such power, the degree to which they can collectively exercise influence on the dominant structure, albeit limited (e.g., Eastville and Westville), is indicative of change in the welfare of their children's education. Major court-ordered plans are usually preceded by active support of local self-help groups and strong community involvement.

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### Overview

1. Five indices of segregation were used: the isolation index E(H,M,50%); three forms of the R index (Coleman's R); and the Dissimilarity index. Our findings indicate that the isolation index increased more between 1972-76 than from 1968-72. Overall, 63% of the districts were more greatly segregated in 1976 than in 1968. When this is controlled for the loss of non-Hispanic enrollment in the larger school districts, segregation still seems virtually unchanged.

2. Examining these Hispanic trends by region, the South remains the most segregated and the Southwest the least segregated. Segregation, as measured by the E index, increased in all regions but the East Coast, and continued its increase in the Midwest for the average Hispanic and non-Hispanic student as measured by R(H,NH).

3. Segregation of Hispanics from Blacks in 1976 exceeded segregation in 1968, even after compensating for the proportion of Blacks in the school systems.

4. Isolation of Hispanics from whites in both predominantly minority (50%) elementary and secondary schools increased from 65% in 1968 to 74% in 1976.

5. As segregation increased, so did the number of Hispanic students needeeding English language instruction.

6. The outcome of bilingual education programs within school desegregation are inconsistent. Bilingual education has been supported to maintain segregation in some districts, made economically unfeasible in tohers, while being yet strengthened in some court remedies and totally disregarded in others.

7. The reported incidence of handicapped conditions among Hispanics is higher in school districts with the greater number of Hispanics, even more than the level of school district segregation. In many cases, these were school districts in moderately segregated school systems.

8. The Hispanic community will not support school desegregation if it is perceived to threaten bilingual education programs.

9. School desegregation has improved school practices for most Hispanics, especially those not enrolled in bilingual education.

10. Overall, suspension rates were highest for Hispanics in moderately segregated districts, where the highest percent of Hispanics attend. This was also true for school retention rates.

11. In other respects, high segregated districts meant less Hispanic enrollment in gifted and talented programs, lower in programs for the learning disabled Hispanic child, and a higher rate of mental retardation as compared to low segregated districts.

12. School segregation affects staff as equally as students. Hispanic professional staff is as segregated as are Hispanic elementary and secondary school students.

13. Blacks are more segregated than Hispanics between schools and across school systems, but segregation of Blacks has decreased more (or increased less) than segregation of Hispanics in the school systems. Over the period studied (1968-1976) the level of segregation for Hispanics and the level of segregation for Blacks converged.

14. In most tri-ethnic communities, where Hispanics, Blacks and Whites constitute a large percentage, Hispanics have become more segregated from Whites or Blacks, and in many school districts they have separated from both.

15. Court ordered desegregation plans are more stringent than voluntary plans and seem to occur in districts which are most racially disparate and where the history of ethnic conflict is high. However, these plans, in the long run, have worked more effectively.

16. When the local community is against school desegregation it will do whatever it can to maintain racial separation. At times, this may be reflected in segregated classrooms within "desegregated" schools.

General Conclusions

1. Present projections indicate that Hispanic isolation from Blacks will probably continue to increase.

2. Projections also indicate that Hispanics are becoming more isolated from Whites.

3. At present rates, Hispanics will become the most segregated racial group in the 1980's.

4. In many tri-ethnic communities, Hispanic segregation from whites and blacks is increasing in unpredictable patterns--at times increasing, at other times decreasing. This is more related to how Hispanics are defined and included in the remedy state of implementation of desegregation.

5. The juxtaposition of bilingual education vs. school desegregation as an either/or option is detrimental to the implementation of school desegregation in Hispanic communities. This need not occur. These processes are not necessarily incompatible or mutually contradictory. Present remedies, however, leave much to be

desired, especially as these relate to Hispanic groups..

## Limitations of the Study

1. The major limitation to the study is its descriptive nature. The report describes segregation trends for Hispanics, with little attempt to explain factors contributing to segregation. For instance, it has not attempted to establish a cause/effect relationship controlling for particular school practices and level of segregation through inferential statistics.

2. The Black comparison group was as that for Hispanics; that is, the school districts were selected on the percentage of Hispanics. Consequently, only one-fourth of all Blacks in this nation's schools are included in this sample, while over three-fourths of all Hispanics in the nation are included.

## Further Analysis Needed

1. Further investigation of the relationship between segregation and school practices, beyond descriptive statistics and contingency tables.

2. Examination of segregation trends for a larger sample of Blacks (or a duplication of the study for blacks).

3. More intensive studies of segregation in specific regions where disparate trends were found (e.g., the South and Midwest).

4. Studies of total segregation of Hispanic students, including within-district segregation.

5. Continued investigation of segregation trends using data for 1978 and subsequent school years.

6. More intensive examination of tri-ethnic composition and segregation patterns.

7. Studies of school districts with 5% Hispanic enrollment or above, but under 3000 total enrollment.

## General Policy Recommendations

1. School desegregation plans should distinguish the needs of Blacks from those of Hispanics, as well as from those of other racial minorities.

2. Desegregation plans should adhere to existing State and Federal guidelines for bilingual education. An attempt should be made to avoid dispersal of NES?LESA students to such an extent that bilingual education at each grade level is rendered economically impractical and pedagogically indefensible.

3. In school desegregation, Hispanic students are less likely to come into contact with a supportive learning environment. In many cases this must be accompanied by the hiring of additional Hispanic staff.